



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/329,321	06/10/1999	MARI KORKEA-AHO	017.36935X00	7967
20457	7590 09/11/2003			•
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP 1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 1800			EXAMINER	
			THOMPSON, MARC D	
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2142	10
			DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003	(•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action		09/329,321	KORKEA-AHO, MARI
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Marc D. Thompson	2142
The MAILING DATE	of this communication a		th the correspondence address
Therefore, further action by t final rejection under 37 CFR	he applicant is required to 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either otimely filed Notice of Ap _l	: (1) a timely filed amendmei peal (with appeal fee); or (3)	N FOR ALLOWANCE. application. A proper reply to a nt which places the application in a timely filed Request for Continued
	PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b	p)]
· = · · · · · ·	ires <u>3 months from the mailing</u>		
no event, however, will the ONLY CHECK THIS BO 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained have been filed is the date for price under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calcula	the statutory period for reply exp X WHEN THE FIRST REPLY value ained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The urposes of determining the period in the period in the period in the expiration data and the control in the expiration and the expir	bire later than SIX MONTHS from the WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH. The date on which the petition under the correspondence of the shortened statutory period stat	set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In the mailing date of the final rejection. IS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP or 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension for reply originally set in the final Office action; or the mailing date of the final rejection, even if
		03. Appellant's Brief must be CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dism	e filed within the period set forth in hissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendr	nent(s) will not be entere	d because:	
(a) ⊠ they raise new iss	sues that would require fu	irther consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issu	ue of new matter (see No	te below);	
(c) ⊠ they are not deem · issues for appeal;		on in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present add	itional claims without can	celing a corresponding numb	per of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Conti	inuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has o	•		
 Newly proposed or am canceling the non-allo 		ould be allowable if submitted	in a separate, timely filed amendment
] exhibit, or c)∏ request n for allowance because:		n considered but does NOT place the
	will NOT be considered ler in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SO	LELY to issues which were newly
		$\operatorname{dent}(s)$ a) \boxtimes will not be enterest would be rejected is provide	ed or b)⊡ will be entered and an ed below or appended.
The status of the claim	n(s) is (or will be) as follow	ws:	
Claim(s) allowed:	<u></u> .		
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 1.3-	-13,15-25 and 27-36.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from	om consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing	correction filed on	_ is a) □ approved or b) □	disapproved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Info	rmation Disclosure State	ment(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)
10. Other:			MARC D. THOMPSON
			MRC THOMPSON PRIMARY EXAMINER



Continuation of 2. NOTE:

The proposed amendment(s) present in the after final amendment B, Paper #7, received on 6/2/2003, introduce limitation(s) drawn toward actual location of mobile device(s) (more specifically, the proposed amendment is understood to include physical proximity to predetermined locations) acting to impact functionality of system components. Additionally, these limitation(s) are now in combination with previously and currently pending dependent limitations, for which no search or consideration of these combination of elements has been previously performed. Thus, further search and consideration is required to properly determine patentability of the newly proposed claimed invention.

MARC D. THOMPSON
MARC THOMPSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER